

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ.—ಈಗ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಇದನ್ನು ಯೋಚಿಸಲಿಲ್ಲವೇ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ? ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನರಿಗೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಹೋಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಬರಬಹುದೆಂದು ತಾವು ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲವೇ ?

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—I have not said that we have not made any enquiry. I have said that I am unable to say anything more about it.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—To question (a): whether prohibition has resulted in mass unemployment to people engaged in liquor trade, the answer is: "No". Then has it resulted in mass employment of people engaged in liquor trade ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is not relevant here.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I leave it to the Chair.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಹನುಮಂತಯ್ಯ.—ಲಿಕ್ವರ್ ಟ್ರೇಡ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿದ್ದವರು ತಮಗೆ ಕೆಲಸವಿಲ್ಲ, ಕೆಲಸ ಕೊಡಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ನಾದರೂ ಅರಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ? ಅರ್ಜಿ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ?

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—No.

Sri L. S. VENKAJI RAO.—Was there a general survey made after the introduction of prohibition in the State about the number of tappers, contractors, etc.?

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—I want notice.

Sri F. H. MOHSIN.—While providing employment to the unemployed, will the Government consider the cases of those engaged in liquor trade ?

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—That will be considered.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Was it a part of the prohibition policy enunciated by Government; did they give any assurance to these people that in the event of their being unemployed, they would be given employment ?

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—I have already answered that. No such guarantee was given.

Uniformity in the levy of Water Charge in Bangalore.

Q.—512. Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU (Cubbonpet).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) whether they are aware of the difference in the minimum free allow-

ance of water allowed for domestic purpose and in the levy of excess water charges as in the City and Civil Area respectively ;

(b) the steps taken to bring uniformity and the stage at which the matter stand now ?

A.—Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH (Minister for Local Self-Government).—

(a) Yes.

(b) This is under consideration.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Am I correct in the presumption that the Hon'ble Minister for Local Self-Government and the Hon'ble Minister for Public Works did not agree with their opinions ?

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—That has nothing to do with this question.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Just now, that is, with reference to Question No. 1244, the Hon'ble Minister for Public Works said that differences were wiped out from 1st April 1956 with regard to the levy of water rate for the whole Corporation area. But in the answer to (a) of Question No. 512 whether there is difference in the minimum free allowance of water and in the levy of excess water charges between the City and Civil Area, it is stated as "Yes".

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—Yes, there is that difference.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Let alone the minimum; I have also referred to the levy of excess water rate as between the City and Civil Station areas in my question No. 1244 and the Hon'ble Minister for Public Works has replied that such differences were removed from 1st April 1956; which answer is correct ?

(There was no answer)

Mr. SPEAKER.—The position is that if the Hon'ble Minister does not reply, the Chair cannot compel him to reply.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—Can the Hon'ble Minister go on sitting without answering ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—If he has no answer to give he can sit.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—What is the Hon'ble Member's difficulty?

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—My difficulty is to understand the answer correctly, because Question No. 512 and Question No. 1244 relate to the same subject. In answer to Clause (a) of Question No. 1244 it was stated just now that all differences with regard to levy of water rate have been removed from 1st April 1956 as between the Civil and City areas and in answer to clause (a) in Question No. 512 whether the Government are aware of the difference in water charges, the answer is "Yes". Therefore I would like to know whether these differences still continue even after 1st April 1956.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—My answer as well as of the Hon'ble Minister for L.S.G. are correct. In this, the general levy of water charges is Re. 0-10-6 per gallon for both the areas.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I rise to a point of order, Sir. My friend Sri Deenadayalu Naidu put a specific question to elicit answer from the Hon'ble Minister for L.S.G. Now the Hon'ble Minister for Public Works is offering explanation. When one Minister is expected to reply, may I know whether another Minister can offer explanation to see that the whole thing subsides which will defeat the very object of putting the question?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is it an argument or. . . . ?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—If the Chair is willing to rule it out I have no objection.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not here to rule out in any way; I will accept or rule out as justice requires. The point is that if any Minister is not in possession of information on the subject, there is no bar for any other Minister to intervene and give replies.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—In this case both the Ministers are concerned.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Apart from that, another Minister can answer.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—I was just saying about the general levy. The charges made for excess supply for industrial purposes and for other purposes are different and also the quantity of free supply in the City area is different from that made in the Civil Area. Therefore this refers to excess charges. That difference is still there and it is being looked into. Therefore the Hon'ble Minister for L.S.G. is not wrong in saying "Yes" in answer to clause (a) of Question No. 512.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—In Question No. 1244 it is stated that the differences are removed from 1st April 1956, and in reply to my question No. 512, Clause (b) as regards the steps taken to bring uniformity the answer is that it is under consideration. Is the answer that the matter is under consideration correct or is the answer already given that the difference existed until 1st April 1956 correct?

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—I am afraid the Hon'ble Member did not understand the answer given by the Hon'ble Minister for Public Works. A uniform rate has just now been introduced in the Corporation area in respect of water charges. Hitherto they were collected by the Public Works Department. From six annas for thousand gallons it has been enhanced to ten annas. With regard to the difference in quantity that is existing between the Civil Area and the City area that still continues. There is no anomaly in this position.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Does the Government agree with me that this anomalous position would be removed only after the distribution agency with regard to water supply is handed over to the Corporation?

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—It will be removed very shortly. There was a special committee to go into this question and that special committee has made certain recommendations on 14th March 1953. Those recommendations were placed before the Corporation on the 13th December 1955 and they have sent a resolution along with the recommendations to the Government. That

(SRI R. CHENNIGARAMIAH)

resolution was discussed on 29th June 1957 at a meeting held in the chambers of the P.W. Minister. The Mayor, the Commissioner and the concerned officers of the Corporation were present. They have taken a decision that the management of the water works should be handed over to the Corporation after 16 MG. supply is over. Now it is over. Just a fortnight ago there was a committee of concerned officers and the Chief Engineer has made a recommendation. That recommendation is being examined and very soon Government Order will issue about the Corporation taking over the management. Then they will introduce uniform rules.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Pending this handing over, what is the difficulty of the Government in not having uniform levy as regards water rate?

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—The difficulty is this. The City area was managed by the Public Works Department and the Civil area by the then Municipality before retrocession. The bye-laws that were framed then have not been amended and they continue even now. Now the question of taking over the entire area by the Corporation as regards water supply has now arisen and orders are about to issue. Then it will be possible to introduce a uniform law.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Question time is over.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

Ordinances.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA (Minister for Labour and Legal Affairs).—Sir, I lay on the Table the Mysore Sales Tax (Amendment) Ordinance, 1957.

Sri M. P. PATIL (Minister for Revenue).—Sir, I lay on the Table the Mysore Tenancy Laws (Amendment) Ordinance, 1957.

MADRAS PRESERVATION OF PRIVATE FORESTS CONTINUANCE BILL, 1958.

Introduction

Sri H. S. RUDRAPPA (Minister for Agriculture).—Sir, I introduce the Madras Preservation of Private Forests Continuance Bill, 1958.

2 P.M.

MOTION ON THE ADDRESS BY THE GOVERNOR.

(*Debate continued*)

Sri C. K. RAJAI AH SETTY (Chick-naikanahalli).—Mr. Speaker, I regret I find no reason why we should thank the Governor for his Address. According to Constitutional provision, speeches are made here. We had the Address last year and this year also. But if we were to look into certain facts mentioned by the Governor during the last year, we see no achievement in respect of the Five-Year Plan. Plans are made to achieve certain things in a short time which would in the normal course require longer time. In the Five-Year Plan period regarding a particular scheme some progress should be achieved in the first year, second year and like that. The Plan is applicable to the entire country. Information as to what we have achieved last year in respect of the several schemes, and proposals for the next year, should be given. Last year it was stated that we will have 168 small size godowns, 30 large size godowns, 20 Health Units, 44 Family Planning Centres, etc. But if we look to the progress, what is the achievement? The achievement is nil. Therefore if we should look to the future achievement it will also be the same. What are needed for the successful implementation of the Plan are, special drive, better vigilance, eradicating corruption, etc. Instead of all this we see a lot of inefficiency, red-tapism, corruption, and maladministration. When we are not having the essential requirements mentioned above for the successful implementation of the Plan,